

duty service members and veterans. A number of the Commission's recommendations fall under the cognizance of the Armed Services Committee. I have carefully reviewed the recommendations and have initiated action to implement many of the improvements and efficiencies recommended by the Commission. As Chairman of this important Congressional Commission, Tony did a superb job with a very difficult task.

Tony's father is a veteran of World War II. His wife, Elizabeth is a veteran of 30 years of service as a Naval officer and his two sons are serving on active duty in the Air Force today.

Tony's personal experiences in a family of veterans as well as a midshipman, Naval officer give him an excellent perspective on the issues facing veterans. His experience as a staff member on the Armed Services and Veterans Affairs Committees and as a Cabinet official in the Department of Veterans Affairs makes Tony uniquely qualified to address the many issues he will face as the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

Mr. President, I had the opportunity to meet with Tony in my office the day prior to his confirmation hearing before the Veterans Affairs Committee. During our discussions, he assured me that he would take timely and positive action to ensure that employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs will assist veterans in applying for benefits and filing claims for reimbursement and payments. This was an important issue on which the Armed Services Committee took a leading role during consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001. I was pleased that Tony agreed that it is a duty of the Department of Veterans Affairs personnel to assist veterans in successfully navigating the difficult claims processes. We also discussed opportunities for increased cooperation between the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs in the health care arena. I look forward to working with Tony on these and other important issues concerning active duty military personnel and veterans.

I support this nomination. I urge my colleagues to support the nomination as well. Secretary Principi will be a crucial part of the great team that President Bush has assembled.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of M. Anthony Principi as Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

Our Nation's veterans are important to all of us. From time and memorial, the men and women of our country's Armed Services have dedicated themselves to freedom and democracy. They have done far more than representing freedom, they have given themselves to the cause, fighting for those inalienable rights that many of us take for granted.

There are 24.8 million veterans in the United States, 165,000 of which are in

my own state of New Mexico. This means that all of us know a veteran. In fact, one out of every four men in the United States is a veteran, and there are 1.2 million female veterans. We must continue to work for the continued well-being of our veterans, as they are our mothers, fathers, grandmothers, and sons.

Health care is important to all of us, and veterans are no exception. I have worked with other members of Congress to dramatically increase funding for veterans' health care. I know that more needs to be done for veterans and pledge myself to work for their interests.

The head of the Department of Veterans Affairs will be presented with unique challenges. The Secretary must be pro-active and must have a comprehensive understanding of veterans' issues.

In that vein, I am confident that Mr. Principi is the best person for the job. As a decorated Vietnam War veteran, Mr. Principi can intimately relate to veterans' special needs.

Furthermore, he can fully appreciate the Department of Veterans Affairs after serving as Secretary and Deputy Secretary of the Department under the previous Bush Administration. Mr. Principi applied his pro-active attitude and experience when he ordered the creation of a registry to track medical conditions of Gulf War veterans.

Furthermore, Mr. Principi chaired the bipartisan Congressional Commission on Military Service Members and Veterans Assistance under the previous Administration.

The Department of Veterans Affairs has put forth significant effort in moving towards a "One V-A" in attempting to deliver seamless service to veterans. Yet, coordinating VA's various missions as technology advances remains just one challenge that Mr. Principi must address.

Mr. Principi is a veteran. He has spent his life working for veterans. Mr. President, Anthony Principi is the best person to head the Department of Veterans Affairs.

As Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs, Mr. Principi will surely be tested. I am confident that he will ace the test.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of Tony Principi's confirmation as Secretary of Veterans Affairs. I have known him for many years both as a staffer and a friend. He was my staff director when I was chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee many years ago. Since then I have come to value his advice and expertise about our nation's veterans as much as I have come to value his friendship. His experience both within the government and the private sector, along with his desire to give veterans the kind of services they deserve, makes Tony the best man for the job. I support his confirmation and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nominations of Mitchell E. Daniels, Jr., to be Director of the Office of Management and Budget; Anthony Joseph Principi, to be Secretary of Veterans Affairs; and Melquiades Rafael Martinez, to be Secretary of Housing and Urban Development?

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 100, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote Nos. 1, 2, 3 Ex.]

YEAS—100

Akaka	Durbin	McCain
Allard	Edwards	McConnell
Allen	Ensign	Mikulski
Baucus	Enzi	Miller
Bayh	Feingold	Murkowski
Bennett	Feinstein	Murray
Biden	Fitzgerald	Nelson (FL)
Bingaman	Frist	Nelson (NE)
Bond	Graham	Nickles
Boxer	Gramm	Reed
Breaux	Grassley	Reid
Brownback	Gregg	Roberts
Bunning	Hagel	Rockefeller
Burns	Harkin	Santorum
Byrd	Hatch	Sarbanes
Campbell	Helms	Schumer
Cantwell	Hollings	Sessions
Carnahan	Hutchinson	Shelby
Carper	Hutchison	Smith (NH)
Chafee	Inhofe	Smith (OR)
Cleland	Inouye	Snowe
Clinton	Jeffords	Specter
Cochran	Johnson	Stabenow
Collins	Kennedy	Stevens
Conrad	Kerry	Thomas
Corzine	Kohl	Thompson
Craig	Kyl	Thurmond
Crapo	Landrieu	Torricelli
Daschle	Leahy	Voinovich
Dayton	Levin	Warner
DeWine	Lieberman	Wellstone
Dodd	Lincoln	Wyden
Domenici	Lott	
Dorgan	Lugar	

The nominations were confirmed.

NOMINATION OF TOMMY G. THOMPSON, OF WISCONSIN, TO BE SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KYL). The clerk will report the next nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Tommy G. Thompson, of Wisconsin, to be Secretary of Health and Human Services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the debate will include 60 minutes of time under the control of Senator WELLSTONE, with 40 minutes for the chairman and ranking minority member of the Finance Committee and 10 minutes each for Senators FEINGOLD, KENNEDY, and REID of Nevada.

Who yields time?

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I had the privilege of hearing Gov. Tommy Thompson, the designee for Secretary of Health and Human Services, when he came before our committee which the distinguished Senator from Montana chaired last week. We had a very good hearing.

I want to compliment Senator BAUCUS for putting together a good hearing and, more importantly, for his cooperation in helping President Bush move many of his nominees through the Senate as quickly as possible, and Senator BAUCUS was responsible for doing that in the case of Secretary of the Treasury O'Neill, and now Secretary of Health and Human Services Governor Thompson.

Last week, we invited then-Governor Thompson to testify. I have to say it was a very refreshing hearing. It became so apparent that the qualities that have made Governor Thompson so successful in Wisconsin are what will also make him very successful as a Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services. This is a very ideal choice that President Bush has made.

First and foremost, Governor Thompson is a problem solver, focused on improving the lives of real people. As Senators of both parties noted during our hearing last week, Governor Thompson has made remarkable progress in addressing the health care needs of families in Wisconsin. Successful programs such as Badger Care and family care reflect his ability to reach consensus and implement concrete solutions. In addition, Governor Thompson is a true innovator. On issues such as Welfare reform he has shown that he is willing to cast away old, tired approaches. He reaches out for new ideas and develops creative solutions to tough problems.

Governor Thompson has also been an effective administrator and manager of his State, expertise that will be critical as he oversees important programs such as Medicare, Medicaid and the State children's health insurance program. Coming from being a Governor of a State, I think he has appreciation that one size doesn't fit all in our great country. A mold poured in Washington, DC, doesn't necessarily solve the problems of New York City or Madison, WI, with the same effectiveness as if we would give some leeway to the Governor of the State of New York and the Governor of the State of Wisconsin leeway in solving those problems that are unique to their respective States and, hence, deserve a unique solution.

I can say from the standpoint of his work on welfare reform that he did not wait for the Federal Government to pass welfare reform before he started working within Federal law with what he could do to improve the system. When we were working on this in 1996, he was able to come to Washington and discuss the expenses and what needed to be done with Federal law to allow each State to have some leeway to help people move from welfare to work, to

give people a chance, to move people from the fringe of our society to the mainstream of our society in order to be in that mainstream and to have the opportunities for advancement and progress as those in the mainstream.

I think he is flexible. That flexibility that he has will serve well not only our Federal policies, but it will also help Governors and State and local administrators do a better job as they have some leeway. Also, as there are some changes in programs that will be suggested by President Bush we in the Congress will work on, as well. It gives citizens an opportunity to have right here in this town, full time, a person who has had the experience of being a Governor—where the rubber meets the road—on Federal programs to make sure that we are able to make the best policy to fit a country that is as geographically vast as ours, with heterogeneous population.

Lastly—and I hope this responds to some of the cynicism of people about Washington being too partisan sometimes I am pleased to report, as Governor Thompson has been successful in his State, he has done it because he has been able to reach across party lines because he himself has followed the same principle of bipartisanship to find successful solutions in his home State by reaching across party lines. That bipartisanship and how it has been successful is shown in the fact he was warmly introduced to our committee by Senator Dole, a Republican, Senator KOHL and Senator FEINGOLD, who are Democrats, and by Secretary Shalala from the present administration, who worked closely with Governor Thompson when she was chancellor of the University of Wisconsin.

This support from party leaders on both sides of the aisle speaks for itself. I hope we in Washington will apply the Governor's bipartisan approach in Congress. I think we will.

As I noted at the hearing, we are in a unique situation in the Senate. Bipartisanship can no longer be a hobby for a few; instead, it needs to be a way of life for all. The American people demand it. We must respond. I think hopefully when we look back at this year and even more so after 2 years of this 107th Congress, we will be able to say that the fact that the Senate was split 50/50 was good because it brought people closer together.

For my part, I respond to the initiatives and the ideas that Governor Thompson brings and to an evenly divided Finance Committee, hoping we will seize the opportunity to solve the real problems we face—modernizing Medicare and improving access to prescription drugs for seniors, reducing the number of 43.5 million uninsured, improving health care in rural communities. That is something that Senator BAUCUS and I have worked closely on over a long period of time, improving long-term care. These are priorities for me, but I am sure they are not just my priorities. They are priorities for many

in this Congress, and particularly those that serve on the Senate Finance Committee.

I look forward to working closely on these priorities, not only with my colleagues, but with Governor Thompson in his new position as secretary HHS. Governor Thompson deserves not only our votes but our thanks for his willingness to serve our country even though it means leaving both a job and a State he loves. I am also grateful to President Bush for choosing such a qualified Senate. He sends a clear signal for his desire for problem solving, effective management, and bipartisanship.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, first, I note the presence of the new Finance Committee chairman. This is the first appearance of our new chairman of the Senate Finance Committee. I know all Senators agree with me in saying we look forward to a very long, prosperous, productive period, and eagerly seek to work with the chairman in a bipartisan nature, noting the 50/50 composition of the Senate. It is a terrific opportunity we have. I know I speak for the chairman in saying he also shares my desire to do the same.

I rise to give my enthusiastic support to the nomination of Governor Tommy Thompson of Wisconsin to be our nation's 19th Secretary of Health and Human Services. I think he will be a great Secretary. He has the energy, the spirit, creativity, enthusiasm, and he takes a bipartisanship approach. He is quite a guy. He has the spirit of his predecessor, another Badger, if I can use that term. Secretary Shalala also had a lot of energy and spirit. I think Governor Thompson, when he does retire from that job and looks back upon his term, will find that he feels good about his achievements, and the rest of the country will as well.

In saying so, I do not mean to imply that I expect to agree with every position of our about-to-be-Secretary. There are clearly going to be some issues on which we disagree—for example, a woman's right to choose and some aspects of the upcoming Medicare debate.

With that said, I think Mr. Thompson is the right person for a very tough job. It is not an easy job. But he is more than up to the task. He is known for many things, probably best of all for his work on welfare reform. He is the nation's leader on this issue, as Governor of Wisconsin where he took the lead on their welfare reform. In many ways, his efforts helped the Senate pass welfare reform legislation. And I was an early supporter of these efforts. Welfare reform has affected our nation very significantly, most particularly in my State of Montana. I credit Governor Thompson. I salute him for taking that initiative.

Just as important, he has provided resources to the programs that are necessary to make Federal reform work

for needy families. If we are going to have welfare reform, certainly the families on welfare need these resources. And he didn't call it welfare reform, but a workfare program. It was obviously the correct approach.

Governor Thompson has also been a leader on health care issues. He has found innovative ways to ensure health care coverage for the working poor. We have heard reference to BadgerCare, a combination of increases in Medicaid and the CHIP program. I teased him a bit in the hearing when I was talking about the BadgerCare program. It is obviously named after the mascot of the University of Wisconsin. The mascot of the University of Montana is the grizzly. I am not so sure "grizzly care" makes much sense in Montana, but I mentioned that to him. Frankly, I am not sure BadgerCare really is that warm and comfortable either, but it gives Wisconsin a deep sense of pride.

Governor Thompson has a reputation for work in other areas: Expanded job training, reform of Wisconsin law to allow women on welfare to keep more of the child support payments they receive. Those of us who know Governor Thompson and who are getting to know him better see him as someone with a reputation who is very honest, who tells you where he stands. An innovator, a risk taker. Perhaps most important of all, as my good friend Chairman GRASSLEY said, he is someone who worked with both Republicans and Democrats to find bipartisan solutions. As the chairman mentioned during the confirmation hearings last week when Governor Thompson appeared before the Finance Committee, he was introduced not only by former majority leader Bob Dole, but also by his two Senators and by Secretary Shalala.

Senator KOHL told us that Governor Thompson's "methods reach across the aisle and his successes reach across the board."

Senator FEINGOLD said that he "values innovation above partisan gridlock."

And outgoing Secretary Shalala said that Thompson is a "consensus builder" rather than an ideologue.

That, to my mind, is precisely what we need. A consensus builder, because the next Secretary faces challenges that defy partisan solutions.

First and foremost, Congress must address the pressing need for Medicare to cover prescription drugs. The practice of medicine has changed dramatically since Medicare was created in 1965. Today, prescription drug therapies play a vital role in medical care.

As we all know, drug prices are rising fast, and our seniors who do not have insurance coverage for prescription drugs pay the highest prices of anyone in the world.

We need to fill this glaring gap in the Medicare program.

Accordingly, it is my sincere hope that we can work together to enact a prescription drug program for all seniors, not just low-income seniors, and that we can do so quickly.

In addition, we need to improve the Medicaid program and the CHIP program for low-income kids. We need to find ways to lend a hand to the 43 million Americans who do not have health insurance. We all call that a national disgrace, that so many Americans do not have health insurance. There is no other country in the modern industrialized world that has such a large percentage of people uninsured. We Americans have to fill that gap quickly.

On each of these issues, I look forward to working with Secretary Thompson to find innovative and bipartisan solutions that improve the delivery of health and human services.

He has my full support, and I urge colleagues to vote to confirm his nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from Minnesota? The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask my good friend from Minnesota if this is a time he wishes to make his longer statement or to withhold. I ask that because the Senator from Delaware asked me some time ago to speak for about 5 minutes.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, as it turns out, I will be brief, too. It turns out I will take only about 10 minutes, 15 at the most.

Mr. BAUCUS. I might say, if that is all right with the Senator from Delaware because he did ask me earlier if he could speak next.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I apologize. I thought I had some time reserved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota does have 60 minutes. Without objection, he is recognized.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, first let me make it clear I am going to support Governor Thompson to be Secretary of Health and Human Services. I do not intend to oppose him, and I look forward to working with him.

When he appeared before the HELP Committee, we had a spirited discussion. I think there are many areas where we can work together. The Secretary of Health and Human Services is very important and there are a lot of areas that are critical to the lives of people in Minnesota where this Secretary is going to be in a key role.

I talked to Governor Thompson, soon to be Secretary Thompson, about having some parity in ending the discrimination in mental health coverage. We talked also about trying to end discrimination when it comes to substance abuse coverage. We talked about the importance of the strong support that Secretary Shalala showed for the Violence Against Women Act and the steps we need to take to reduce that violence.

I think Senator HARKIN asked the question about stem cell research, how important it is not only for people struggling with Parkinson's but for people struggling with other diseases. I thought we covered a lot of issues that are extremely important. I believe Sec-

retary-to-be Thompson will be an important leader in these areas.

I want to talk about one area of disagreement, though not a lot, which is why I want to take some time on the floor. It is an appeal to Governor Thompson. It is an appeal to colleagues. It is something I intend to be vigilant about as a Senator from Minnesota. It has to do with TANF or what we call welfare reform.

As my colleague pointed out, Montana has been viewed as a State which is a leader in welfare reform—as a model, by some, for welfare reform. But what troubles me is that all too often we define reform as reduction of the caseload. None of us ever intended that welfare reform should be equated, ipso facto, with just the number of people who no longer receive welfare. The question was whether or not these families, almost all of them headed by women with children, all of them low-income, were able to move from welfare to economic self-sufficiency.

It just does not suffice to say that in Wisconsin or Minnesota or Delaware or Montana or anywhere in the country, TANF has been a huge success because we have cut the rolls by 50, 70, or 80 percent. The question is whether or not we have reduced the poverty. I raised these figures during our hearing. It is not really just about Wisconsin, which is a State I dearly love, and not to talk about a Governor in the negative who, frankly, has put more investment into child care and job training and health coverage than many Governors have, but it is interesting and important and I asked the Governor about this.

When it comes to infant mortality, in 1996–1998 Wisconsin had the highest Hispanic infant mortality rate in the country and the fourth highest black infant mortality rate in the United States of America.

I believe the figures in the early 1990s were different. Wisconsin really ranked well. They did well compared with other States in the country. When it comes to neonatal mortality rates, in 1989–1991 Wisconsin had the seventh best black infant neonatal rate. By 1997–1998, it had the fifth worst neonatal infant mortality rate in the United States. Wisconsin lagged dead last in the country for Hispanic neonatal infant mortality—double the U.S. average in 1996–1998.

Why do I say this? Not to bash away at this Governor, who has been one of the leaders and has been willing to make more of the up-front investment, but to point out to colleagues that when you ask this Governor and other Governors—there is at least one former Governor here who might disagree with me—about welfare reform, they will say it has been a great success. Then you ask: Do you have the empirical data? Can you tell me where are these families? Do the mothers have jobs? Are they living wage jobs? What is the child care situation? Or, in the United States of America post-1996, do you know that there has been a 30-percent

decline in food stamp participation, which is the major safety net program for poor children in America, to make sure they do not go without food? Ask what has happened.

What has happened is we have become so anti-welfare that we are neglecting to tell people they are eligible for some of these benefits.

So I want to make the case today not against Governor Thompson, but that even in Wisconsin, which is recognized as a State where you had a Governor who was willing to make more of the up-front investment, you have had a situation where there is some troubling data when it comes to the infant mortality rate, especially for children of color.

I will tell you something. I believe all of us have been guilty of not wanting to look at the data. Sometimes we do not know what we do not want to know. What I want to know and what I want to know from this administration is, as the TANF bill, welfare, comes up to reauthorization: Have we just dramatically reduced the rolls or have we really reduced the poverty?

I can go through studies that will tell you that, in the majority of cases, these women do not have living-wage jobs. I can tell you too many of these families have lost medical assistance. I can tell you, based upon a Berkeley-Yale study, that the child care situation is really quite dangerous and inadequate. And I can tell you that just because you have single parents and just because they have children and just because they are scapegoated and just because it is easy to be anti-welfare, we better make sure in this reauthorization that we do it right.

That is why I speak because this Governor, this Secretary to be, is going to be playing a critical role.

I will just conclude, since I do not have a lot of time, by showing a couple of charts which I have which make my point. I asked the Governor about this, I say to my colleague from Montana, during the hearing. If you look at President Bush's proposed tax cut, which ultimately we are talking about \$1.6 trillion in tax cuts over the next 10 years, and you add to that interest, and you add to that Pentagon expenditures, and you add to that what we must put into the Social Security trust fund, and you add to that what we must spend for Medicare, do you know how much money you are going to have for children, for job training, for child care, for education and all the rest? Zero dollars.

So I would say to Governor Thompson, and I say to this administration: How are we going to do welfare reform right so we do make sure that women and poor children do not pay the price? Where is the investment in child care going to be? Where is the investment in education going to be? Where is the investment in job training going to be? I do not see any dollars for it. That is what I am worried about.

We all say we care so much about the elderly. I have two parents I des-

perately wanted to stay at home and not be in a nursing home. They both had Parkinson's disease. Where is the money going to come from for the investment to make sure our parents and grandparents can live at home in normal circumstances with dignity, with \$1.6 trillion in tax cuts.

Finally—and this goes way beyond Governor Thompson—no child left behind? This is President Bush's education reform. I have heard some language about this on the floor today. Here is where we are heading in my not, I will admit, so humble opinion.

Putting vouchers aside, which is a nonstarter, you are going to have mandatory testing in every State when it comes to title I children, low-income children, low-income neighborhoods, low-income schools. In the school districts, they are going to hire consultants to teach teachers how to teach for the tests. The kids are going to have consultants to teach them how to take the tests. It is going to be drill education. It is going to be educationally deadening. That is what is going on in the country. And do you know something else? We are setting up all these kids and all these teachers—I have two children to teach—and we are going to set up all these schools for failure because the accountability does not stop at the school door. What about us, Democrats and Republicans, and what about President Bush? How can you leave no child behind when you have \$1.6 trillion in tax cuts which erodes the revenue base and makes it impossible to expand funding for Head Start, child care, the title I program, and the IDEA program, which is nowhere fully funded.

This is not a step forward. It is a great leap sideways. This is a great leap backwards. Fannie Lou Hamer, a great civil rights leader, once uttered the immortal words:

I'm sick and tired of being sick and tired.

I am going to make a fairly angry statement today: I am sick and tired of playing symbolic politics with children's lives. If you want to have children pass these tests, first, do not rely on one standardized test; have multiple measures. Then you make the investment in these children so every child has an opportunity to achieve, do well, and pass tests.

This cannot be done. You cannot "leave no child behind" on a tin-cup budget. I want to know whether this administration is serious about these investments. I will wait to see the budget, and I hope Democrats, if this administration wants to govern at the center of children's lives, and it wants to make this investment so these kids come to kindergarten ready to learn, I say to the Presiding Officer, I am willing to work together. If this administration does not do that and just have these tests, then all we have done is set these children, these teachers, and these schools up for failure.

It will be cynical, it will be counterproductive, and as a Senator from Min-

nesota, I will draw the line, and I hope other Senators will as well. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I yield now to a new Senator. I look forward to hearing from the former Governor of the State of Delaware, Mr. CARPER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding and for the opportunity to speak today.

For the last 8 years, I served as Governor of Delaware and a colleague of Governor Thompson. During that period of time, my family was fortunate enough to be a guest in his home. We have eaten at his table. There were times over the last 8 years when we crossed swords—rarely. But there have been many more times when we found there was common ground and the opportunity to work together for the good of Wisconsin, Delaware, and the other 48 States.

He was chairman of the National Governors' Association for a year. He was also the chairman for our Center for Best Practices within the National Governors' Association. In those roles, I found him to be, first of all, pragmatic; secondly, I found him to be innovative.

I found Governor Thompson to be someone who is civil, who really does not just talk about bipartisanship, but he actually means it and lives it. I found in Governor Thompson someone who really tries to treat his colleagues the way he would want to be treated.

I want to pause for a moment and direct my thoughts and attention to welfare reform. Some people think it is possible to do welfare reform on the cheap and we simply set time limits and push people off a cliff at the end of that period of time. Governor Thompson does not approach welfare reform that way, nor do I, nor do most of our Governors.

When welfare was actually created over 60 years ago, we set up a system with the best of intentions, but a system that unwittingly turned out to encourage people to get on welfare and have children out of wedlock, have them early, and for fathers to walk away from those responsibilities and for people to be better off by staying on welfare.

What Governor Thompson has done and what Governors across the country have done is to say maybe we should change the incentives we set up over the last 60 years so people are better off when they go to work, not by staying on welfare.

For Gov. Tommy Thompson, it has meant spending more money on child care, not less.

For Gov. Tommy Thompson, it has been spending more money on health care to make sure when people leave welfare they do not also lose health care for themselves and their families.

For Gov. Tommy Thompson, it has been providing transportation so people have the opportunity to take a job

and actually have a way of getting there.

For Gov. Tommy Thompson, and for the rest of us, it has meant changing our tax policies as well so people are not penalized for the first dollar they make when they go to work but actually are able to realize and keep that purchasing power they have earned.

He does not believe in welfare reform on the cheap. He has a good, realistic, tough-love approach. Sure, there is a toughness to it, but there is also real love and compassion, and I believe he will take those same qualities to his new post as Secretary if we confirm him, which I hope we will.

Another way I got to know him, believe it or not, is through Amtrak. The President historically appoints one Governor to serve on the Amtrak board. He was on the Amtrak board before me. President Clinton appointed me to serve for 4 years, and at the end of my service, I recommended the President appoint Governor Thompson again. Not only that, he ended up serving as the chairman of the board for Amtrak. In that capacity, he has helped to focus, spread, and expand passenger rail service, to improve the quality of that passenger rail service, to find ways to reduce Amtrak's operating budget deficit, to invest in the infrastructure of passenger rail service, and to try to be fair to not just the customers but the folks who work for Amtrak.

In closing, I am delighted to be able to stand here before you today to say this is somebody I know, somebody I have known for a long time. This is someone of whom the people of Wisconsin can be proud. This is someone I am proud to express my support for today and to encourage my colleagues to support his nomination.

I thank the Chair. I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I thank Senator CARPER for those warm remarks about the Secretary-to-be, Governor Thompson. I say to the Senator—he may not know this—when Governor Thompson and the Amtrak board were trying to negotiate further funding for Amtrak, there was a proposal to take certain funds out of the highway trust fund. I had a somewhat tense meeting in the office of the Senator's predecessor, Senator Roth, with Governor Thompson and many others on how to handle all this.

Frankly, I was adamant that money not come out of the trust fund. My point being, very much to his credit and to the Senator from Delaware, we worked out another solution as the bonding authority to provide resources to Amtrak. I am very grateful and appreciative of the way in which Governor Thompson handled that issue; that is, we both wanted to accomplish the same goals and objectives: Further funding for Amtrak, but not at the expense of the highway trust fund, money

motorists paid in gasoline taxes which should go back to the States for highways. Rather, we saw another way and both sides were happy. I commend the Senator from Delaware, as well as Governor Thompson. This is an early example of this is a guy with whom we can work, who is straight, pragmatic, and looks for solutions. That made a positive impression upon me.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time. The Senator from Wisconsin seeks the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous agreement, the Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, while the distinguished Senator certainly has it right, he knows what it is like to watch Tommy Thompson in action and to watch him try to solve a problem. His assessment is right and so is the assessment of the former Governor and now new Senator from Delaware who, as so many other Governors, has told me how much they have enjoyed and benefitted from working with Governor Thompson. It is uniform.

That is also the experience we have had in Wisconsin. I think I speak for myself, as well as for the senior Senator, Mr. KOHL. We are the two Senators who have worked with Tommy Thompson throughout the 14 years he has been the Governor of our State. No one in the long history of our great State has served as Governor longer, and he is a very popular Governor.

For me, I marvel at him. I used to listen to older legislators talk about having known a person for many years and worked with them for many years. I am getting there with this one. I started working with Governor Thompson, then State representative Tommy Thompson, when I was in my twenties. Now 18 years later, I can tell you it has been an excellent relationship. Our roles have changed over the years, but consistently I have found it a pleasure to work with Governor Thompson, and I think you will find it the same when he becomes Secretary.

We worked together on a wide range of issues—increasing access to home- and community-based services for the elderly and the disabled, and expanding health care for children and their families.

I want to mention a couple things.

Everybody talks about, of course, the signature issue of Governor Thompson—welfare reform. It is probably the most well-known example of his can-do attitude.

We in Wisconsin can be proud that our State was the first in the Nation to submit a welfare plan under the 1996 law that created the temporary services to needy families, or the TANF program. In fact, I am very proud of our Governor on this. The Wisconsin plan was submitted on the very day that President Clinton signed the TANF program into law.

Tommy Thompson has also been very devoted to the issue of child care. Be-

cause of his record, Wisconsin is also proud of its rating among the top 10 States in the Nation for the quality of child care by Working Mother magazine. The national recognition is a testament to the unprecedented investments Wisconsin continues to make in safe, affordable child care.

In the area of research, which is so very important across the country, and especially to those of us in Wisconsin and those of us who take such pride in our great university and its research abilities, this man, as Governor, has been a great supporter of medical research. He has been a vocal advocate of funding research at the University of Wisconsin, setting up an incubator for transferring that technology to the private sector. The Governor proposed a \$317 million initiative to build a series of state-of-the-art research centers at the University of Wisconsin, Madison campus.

With regard to what we like to call BadgerCare, Tommy Thompson has worked with both Republicans and Democrats in Wisconsin to enact BadgerCare, Wisconsin's program to expand health care coverage opportunities to children and their families. He has tirelessly promoted BadgerCare's ideals—the idea that children have a much better chance of being healthy and doing well in school when they have a chance to live in a healthy family.

When BadgerCare took effect on July 1, 1999, again, as has been so often the case under Governor Thompson, Wisconsin became the first State in the Nation with a health insurance program that supports parents as well as children. This program has had a number of successes. According to the most recent statistics, more than 74,000 children and their families are now covered under BadgerCare.

Finally, I want to say a word about something on which Tommy Thompson and I worked together for many years, and that is our so-called Community Options Program in Wisconsin. We worked together, on a bipartisan basis, to support efforts to expand what we call the Community Options Program, which, better than any other State in the country, in my view, provides cost-effective home- and community-based, long-term care alternatives to institutions and nursing homes.

Wisconsin was already on this issue and working effectively to find alternatives in the late 1970s, but there has been significant growth, on a bipartisan basis, on this issue ever since Governor Thompson became Governor in 1986. I think we all recognize that a lot more needs to be done to reform our long-term care system. It is one of my highest priorities.

I noticed, when I had the honor of introducing Governor Thompson to the HELP Committee, that many of the members mentioned long-term care. Perhaps the most mentioned issue was either home- and community-based care or home health care. Governor

Thompson is the right person to work on this issue. I believe he will use his experience as an innovator to make it easier for States such as Wisconsin to pursue their own reforms, such as making Federal long-term waivers more flexible and making it easier for States to apply for those waivers.

So after 18 years, I can talk about a lot of other very positive reasons we are lucky to have Tommy Thompson as our new Secretary of Health and Human Services. But let me say, all of us in Wisconsin are very proud, and it will take some getting used to having a different Governor just because it seems as though Tommy Thompson has been our Governor forever. Of course, he has been very popular in that regard. But I think it will be a good opportunity for the country to see firsthand what it is like to have a person who has a "can-do" attitude, a person who really enjoys simply solving problems rather than trying to divide people. I think that has been a hallmark of his role as our Governor. I think it will be a hallmark of his role as the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

I thank the ranking member and thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I do not know of any others on our side who wish to speak on this nomination. It is my understanding that there are no other Senators on the other side of the aisle who wish to speak on this nomination as well. I do not see other Senators who have special orders to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would advise the Senator from Montana, both Senator KENNEDY and Senator REID also asked to speak for 10 minutes pursuant to the agreement.

Mr. BAUCUS. Right.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. ENZI. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. ENZI pertaining to the introduction of S. 149 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. ENZI. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I ask to speak as in morning business for 8 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE BUDGET

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I am worried. I expressed this concern before the inauguration, and I hoped that cooler heads would prevail after the inauguration. Specifically, as I said at that time, surplus, surplus, everywhere a man cries surplus, and there is no surplus.

Right to the point, I have been looking for a surplus since we had one in 1968 and 1969, almost 32 years ago. I worked with George Mahon, then chairman of the Appropriations Committee. We called over to the Capitol, and we asked Marvin Watson to check with President Johnson to see if we could cut another \$5 billion from the budget. I think it was around December of 1968, and, at that particular time, there was no Budget Committee. The fiscal year used to run from July to the end of June the following year. We were given permission. We cut the budget. The entire budget amounted to some \$178 billion. Now remember, that was guns and butter, the war in Vietnam, and domestic needs.

Now, here we are, facing \$362 billion just in interest costs—almost \$1 billion a day. The government is spending more in interest costs than it spent for the entire budget in 1968 and 69—far more, more than double the amount, for nothing. Then I look at the record, and I follow it very closely because back in 1997, when we passed the so-called Balanced Budget Act, I was on the floor with my distinguished colleague from New Mexico, the chairman of the Budget Committee. I said if that Balanced Budget Act works, I will jump off the Capitol dome.

Mr. President, around the fall of last year, I was looking up the price of a parachute because we were getting pretty close to a surplus. When President George Bush left town, the deficit was \$403.6 billion. In other words, we were spending over \$400 billion more than we were taking in. Of course, we have done that for 30 years. There has been no surplus in the entire 30-year-period since our last surplus. We ended fiscal year 2000 with a deficit of \$23 billion. As of September 30th, the year 2000, almost 4 months ago, it was \$23 billion.

I carry around, in a similar fashion as my distinguished friend from West Virginia—he carries around the Constitution, and I carry around a little sheet, as much as I can keep it up to date, called "The Public Debt To The Penny."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this sheet printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PUBLIC DEBT TO THE PENNY

	Amount
Current: January 22, 2001	\$5,728,195,796,181.57
Current month:	
January 19, 2001	5,727,776,738,304.64
January 18, 2001	5,725,695,166,475.90
January 17, 2001	5,718,517,343,351.92
January 16, 2001	5,711,790,291,567.40
January 12, 2001	5,735,197,779,458.19
January 11, 2001	5,734,110,648,665.41
January 10, 2001	5,724,315,917,828.49
January 9, 2001	5,725,066,298,944.04
January 8, 2001	5,719,910,230,364.19
January 5, 2001	5,722,338,254,319.31
January 4, 2001	5,719,452,925,490.54
January 3, 2001	5,723,237,439,563.59
January 2, 2001	5,728,739,508,558.96
Pror months:	
December 29, 2000	5,662,216,013,697.37
November 30, 2000	5,709,669,281,427.00
October 31, 2000	5,657,327,531,667.14
Pror fiscal years:	
September 29, 2000	5,674,178,209,886.86
September 30, 1999	5,656,270,901,615.43
September 30, 1998	5,526,193,008,897.62
September 30, 1997	5,413,146,011,397.34
September 30, 1996	5,224,810,939,135.73
September 29, 1995	4,973,982,900,709.39
September 30, 1994	4,692,749,910,013.32
September 30, 1993	4,411,488,883,138.38
September 30, 1992	4,064,620,655,521.66
September 30, 1991	3,665,303,351,697.03
September 28, 1990	3,233,313,451,777.25
September 29, 1989	2,857,430,960,187.32
September 30, 1988	2,602,337,712,041.16
September 30, 1987	2,350,276,890,953.00

Source: Bureau of the Public Debt.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, everyone in this land and those out in China and anywhere else can look up the public debt to the penny on the Internet.

Yes, if the deficit or debt went up some \$23 billion in fiscal year 2000, and they are claiming a surplus, let's see where it was cut in the last 3½ months. I look and, instead, to my dismay but not to my surprise, the debt ended up at some \$5.674 trillion in the last fiscal year. I look today, and, as of 1/22/2001, the public debt was \$5.728 trillion. So you can subtract these two figures, and you can see that the debt has gone up some \$54 billion.

While we are heading toward enlarging deficits and debts, everywhere man cries "Surplus!"—even those with the best of credibility. I worked with the distinguished Senator from Texas, Mr. GRAMM, on Gramm-Rudman-Hollings. Incidentally, if you want to have political anonymity, cosponsor a bill with my distinguished friend from Texas. They've called it Gramm-Rudman from then on—which suits me.

Today, I picked up the morning paper. And right down on page A2, it says, "right now our surplus has never been greater." He thinks the surplus has never been greater, yet we still have rising debt.

Instead, I wish everybody would turn to the "Tax-Cut Mania" article on page A17 of today's Washington Post.

I ask unanimous consent this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAX-CUT MANIA

(By Steven Rattner)

With the economy visibly weakening, the pre-election debate over the Bush tax cut has nearly turned into a post-election stampede. But even if the economy tips modestly into recession, that still shouldn't panic us into full-sized tax cuts.

Haven't we learned anything about economic policy in the past eight years? Nothing has contributed more to our current